



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in agreement with the facts upon which the opposing theory was based. In your article I find a statement of a theory of memory, which regards this phenomenon as an expression of "the preservation of living forms," and I find it stated that my theory of memory is inadequate. Yet I am unable to ascertain from your article what are the facts with which you support these statements. I find, in your article, statements based upon statements, and I find hypotheses evolved from preconceptions, but I do not find statements based upon facts.

Finally, Sir, I may be permitted to draw attention to the misleading nature of your dictum that "Professor Robertson's reduction of this statement to a mathematical formula, $\log n = Kr + b$, where n is the number of syllables memorized, r the number of repetitions, and K and b are constants, . . . adds nothing to the explanation of the phenomenon itself." While it is perfectly true that the mathematical formulation of an hypothesis adds nothing whatever to the content of the hypothesis, yet when that mathematical formulation is applied to quantitative measurements, and the identity between the demands of theory and the facts of experiment is established, then much is added to the "explanation of the phenomenon itself," for the validity of the hypothesis is rendered proportionately the more probable. Quantitative evidence differs in no respect from qualitative evidence, save in the fact that the qualities compared are expressed in numerical units; but since the acquisition of qualitative must necessarily precede that of quantitative evidence, our knowledge of a phenomenon is the more complete the more it assumes a quantitative character.

T. BRAILSFORD ROBERTSON.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

DR. EDMUND MONTGOMERY.

Dr. Montgomery is a unique figure in the philosophical world. Having been a prominent member of the Concord School, he belongs to the history of this country, though he has contributed voluminously to the periodicals of the Old World, and is credited with having blazed new paths into biological fields.

By descent, Scotch; by birth, English; by education, German; by residence, American, Dr. Montgomery's life has been more than ordinarily eventful; yet he wrote recently in response to a request for autobiographical data: "Long ago I resolved that if a call should

come during my lifetime to furnish notes concerning my personal history, I should ask permission to keep silence with regard to everything not directly connected with my work. I think that with the exception of very eventful careers, run by extraordinary characters, it is inflicting a grievance on the reading public in these crowded times to thrust one's personal matters upon their attention. It would not greatly disappoint me to learn that my name and personalities would not long be remembered; but it would discourage me to learn that after close examination my biological researches and my thoughts proved not to have probed deeper, a little deeper than hitherto, the secrets of life and nature."

At Frankfort young Montgomery participated enthusiastically in the German Revolution of 1848-9, following with absorbing interest the parliamentary discussions, and eventually taking active part in the building and defense of the barricades. It was here, too, he experienced struggles with the problems of religion which drove him almost to suicide. Subsequent years brought him into intimate relations with many of the world's foremost workers in science and philosophy.

While on the Medical Staff of St. Thomas' Hospital in London, and in consequence of a dissecting wound, his lungs became effected. Residence in a milder climate seemed imperative. He went, therefore, greatly dejected, to Madeira. There his medical practice increased overmuch, and placed too great a tax upon his strength. Again changing residence, he went to the Riviera and eventually to Rome. But tiring of having no settled home, he harkened to the call of the new world, whither friends, similarly afflicted and instigated with the same ideals had preceded him, sending back most encouraging reports. In the year 1873 he purchased the Liendo Plantation near Hempstead, Texas, where he has ever since lived, enjoying until lately good health, and devoting himself to his cherished biological researches and philosophical studies.

His wife was the well-known sculptor, Elizabet Ney, whom he first met in his school-days at Heidelberg, and whom he married at Madeira in 1863. Together they shared the joys and sorrows of life, engaged in their separate fields of labor, until June 1907, when the artist-wife, after an illness of about one month, died of heart disease. In October of that year an article by Mrs. Bride Neill Taylor appeared in *The Open Court* which gives a detailed account of the life and work of this famous artist, and is accompanied with illustrations of her most notable works of art.

Dr. Montgomery worked out his philosophy in a period when metaphysicism was confronted with materialism, and no middle ground was recognized. Being a physician by profession, and having specialized his work in physiology, Dr. Montgomery was too much of a naturalist to accept the idealistic horn of the dilemma, while, on the other hand, he was too well acquainted with the insufficiencies of naturalism to fall a prey to materialism. So he steered a middle course and found a solution of the world-riddle in "vital organization." His solution consisted in pointing out, with much attention to detail, the mystery of mysteries which is the wonderful activity of purpose-endowed life with its powers of choice and self-adaptation; and so it was but natural that his whole philosophy is tinged with a poetical mysticism.

The matured fruit of Dr. Montgomery's life has appeared of late in a stately octavo volume of 462 pages, entitled *Philosophical Problems in the Light of Vital Organization*, and we deem it proper to have a summary of the work presented by a man who, for more than twenty years, has been an ardent admirer of the Scotch-German-American hermit-philosopher of Texas. We cannot help thinking that Dr. Montgomery's solutions of the several problems are often unsatisfactory, however elegantly they may be worded. They discuss, but do not adequately answer the questions presented, and sometimes read more like prose poems than philosophy. But he assigned himself large tasks, tasks that involved intellect of an unusual type—the periscopic sweep of the pansophist and the thorough-going patience of the scientific specialist. *In magnis voluisse sat est.* So Dr. Montgomery is a remarkable figure, and as we do not mean to restrict the pages of *The Monist* to our own type of thinking, we gladly welcome to our columns a presentation of Dr. Montgomery's philosophy of "vital organization."

EDITOR.

MALAY NOT ACCEPTABLE.

To the Editor of The Monist:

There are one or two points in your remarks in the July *Monist* where in my opinion you seem to err. You consider the present situation as a good parallel to that when Volapük fell. It is a parallel in one way, but a counterpart in another. The Volapük reformers did have to create an entirely new language, on a basis vastly different from Volapük. It did, of course, take them many years to bring out "Idiom Neutral," and in the meantime they could not but lose the great public. Now, the public is simply invited to choose